

consideration applications which do not meet minimum program requirements. Such requirements will be specified in the program announcement. Applications determined to be qualified and eligible for further consideration will then be considered under the peer review process.

(c) Ratings will be in the form of numerical scores assigned by individual peer reviewers as illustrated in the OJJDP “Peer Review Guideline.” The results of peer review under a competitive program will be a relative aggregate ranking of applications in the form of “Summary Ratings.” The results of peer review for a noncompetitive new or continuation project will be in the form of numerical scores based on criteria established by the Administrator.

(d) Peer review recommendations, in conjunction with the results of internal review and any necessary supplementary review, will assist the Administrator’s consideration of competitive, noncompetitive, applications and selection of applications for funding.

(e) Peer review recommendations are advisory only and are binding on the Administrator only as provided by section 262(d)(B)(i) for noncompetitive assistance awards to programs determined through peer review not to be of such outstanding merit that an award without competition is justified. In such case, the determination of whether to issue a competitive program announcement will be subject to the exercise of the Administrator’s discretion.

§ 34.105 Peer review methods.

(a) For both competitive and noncompetitive applications, peer review will normally consist of written comments provided in response to the general selection criteria established under subpart A of this part and any program specific selection criteria identified in the program announcement or otherwise established by the Administrator, together with the assignment of numerical values. Peer review may be conducted at meetings with peer reviewers held under OJJDP oversight, through mail reviews, or a combination of both. When advisable, site visits may also be employed. The method of peer review anticipated for

each announced competitive program, including the evaluation criteria to be used by peer reviewers, will be specified in each program announcement.

(b) When peer review is conducted through meetings, peer review panelists will be gathered together for instruction by OJJDP, including review of the OJJDP “Peer Review Guideline”. OJJDP will oversee the conduct of individual and group review sessions, as appropriate. When time or other factors preclude the convening of a peer review panel, mail reviews will be used. For competitive programs, mail reviews will be used only where the Administrator makes a written determination of necessity.

§ 34.106 Number of peer reviewers.

The number of peer reviewers will vary by program (as affected by the volume of applications anticipated or received). OJJDP will select a minimum of three peer reviewers (qualified individuals who are not officers or employees of the Department of Justice) for each program or project review in order to ensure a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives. In no case will fewer than three reviews be made of each individual application.

§ 34.107 Use of Department of Justice staff.

OJJDP will use qualified OJJDP and other DOJ staff as internal reviewers. Internal reviewers determine applicant compliance with basic program and statutory requirements, review the results of peer review, and provide overall program evaluation and recommendations to the Administrator.

§ 34.108 Selection of reviewers.

The Program Manager, through the Director of the OJJDP program division with responsibility for a particular program or project will propose a selection of peer reviewers from an extensive and varied pool of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention experts for approval by the Administrator. The selection process for peer reviewers is detailed in the OJJDP “Peer Review Guideline”.